

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2006

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-23 and 25-43 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 15, 18, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 35 are amended, claim 43 is added and claims 2-3 and 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,559,826 to Mendelson et al. (hereafter Mendelson). The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a sensor configured to measure a brightness of a display screen at each of a plurality of brightness levels and to output brightness signals corresponding to each of the plurality of brightness levels, and a controller configured to receive the brightness signals and to compare the received brightness signals with a plurality of brightness signals set according to an output feature of display based on the comparison. Independent claim 1 also recites the brightness control codes to selectively adjust a brightness of the display screen, the brightness control codes structured in an EDID format.

Mendelson does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1 (as well as the other independent claims). More specifically, Mendelson does not teach or suggest the claimed comparison of the received brightness signals with a plurality of brightness signals set according to an output feature of display. More specifically, Mendelson merely describes that a monitor-specific reference profile of a monitor 216 may be stored in a second memory section 595b of a memory device 595. See column 10, lines 48-51. The memory device 595 may be

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2006

reprogrammed to update the reference profile. See column 10, lines 62-67. For example, brightness of images may be measured and translated into luminescence values. The luminance values may be then recorded within the memory 595. See col. 14, lines 50-60. After the luminance is recorded, calculations may be formed to determine an amount of degradation for each lamp since the monitor 216 was initially calibrated. The degradation data may then be used to determine an updated colorimetric reference profile. See column 14, lines 61-67. Stated differently, Mendelson merely shows that degradation of various lamps may be determined over the use of the monitor 216. Another profile may be determined based on the degradation. However, this does not teach or suggest to compare the received brightness signal with a plurality of brightness signals set according to an output feature of display.

The Office Action (on page 8, lines 8-14) discusses the claimed brightness control codes. The Office Action appears to assert that Mendelson discloses that the controller outputs control codes based on data from sensor 610. However, Mendelson does not teach or suggest the brightness signals set according to an output feature of display and output brightness control codes based on the comparison. The Office Action also cites col. 9, lines 43-48. However, this does not suggest the claimed features. Still further, when addressing claims 2 and 3, the Office Action cites sections that do not suggest outputting the claimed brightness control codes.

Mendelson does not teach or suggest measuring a brightness of a display screen at each of plurality of brightness levels. Furthermore, Mendelson does not teach or suggest a controller to compare the received brightness signals with a plurality of brightness signals set according to an output feature of display and to output brightness control codes based on the comparison

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2006

where the brightness control codes to selectively adjust brightness of the display screen. Rather, Mendelson merely describes that a profile may be recalibrated for the degraded lamps. There is no teaching or suggestion for the output of brightness control codes based on the comparison. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Independent claim 12 recites a display portion and a memory of the computer system configured to store a plurality of brightness control codes set by feature of a display by products that can be used by a controller of the computer system to set the display screen to a corresponding plurality of predetermined brightness levels. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest these features. More specifically, Mendelson does not suggest to store a plurality of brightness control codes set by feature of a display by products to set the display screen to a corresponding plurality of predetermined brightness levels. Further, as stated above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest the claimed plurality of brightness control codes. Accordingly, independent claim 12 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 15 recites a display screen and a sensor of the computer system configured to sense a brightness of the display screen at a plurality of brightness levels and to output brightness signals, and a controller of the computer system coupled to the display screen and the sensor and configured to reset a plurality of brightness control codes corresponding to the plurality of brightness levels based on the brightness signals output by the sensor. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 15. Thus, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2006

Independent claim 23 recites reading brightness control codes from a memory of the display in the computer system, wherein each of the brightness control codes corresponds to a different predetermined brightness level of the display, and the stored brightness control codes are set by feature of the display by products. Independent claim 23 also recites controlling a brightness of the display using the brightness control codes and a brightness control code received from a sensor. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest these features. The Office Action cites col. 12, lines 37-col. 13, line 8. However, this section does not relate to the claimed brightness control codes. Accordingly, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 28 recites adjusting the driving of the display until the display is driven at a predetermined brightness level, and setting a brightness control code corresponding to the predetermined brightness level, wherein the driving includes initially driving the display using a brightness control code provided by a display manufacturer, and wherein setting the brightness control code includes setting a new brightness control code that replaces the brightness control code provided by the display manufacturer. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 28. More specifically, Mendelson does not teach or suggest setting a brightness control code and/or setting a new brightness control code that replaces the brightness control code provided by the display manufacturer. Additionally, the Office Action cites col. 12, lines 37-col. 8 for features relating to driving until the display is driven at a predetermined brightness level. However, the cited section does not relate to driving at a predetermined brightness level. Rather, the cited

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2006

section relates to measuring chromaticity values. Thus, independent claim 28 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 36 recites adjusting the driving of the display until the display is driven at a predetermined brightness level, setting a brightness control code corresponding to the predetermined brightness level, and repeating the driving, sensing, adjusting and setting a plurality of times to set a plurality of different brightness control codes corresponding to a plurality of different predetermined brightness levels. Independent claim 36 further recites using one of the brightness control codes corresponding to a desired brightness level to drive the display at the desired brightness level. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 36. Thus, independent claim 36 defines patentable subject matter.

Additionally, independent claim 43 recites a sensor configured to measure a brightness of a display screen and to output a brightness signal. Independent claim 43 further recites a controller configured to receive the brightness signal and to compare the received brightness signal with a predetermined plurality of brightness signals set according to an output feature of display by products and to output brightness control codes based on a result of the comparison, wherein the brightness control codes to selectively adjust a brightness of the display screen. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Mendelson does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 43. Thus, independent claim 43 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 12, 15, 23, 28, 36 and 43 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2006

the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4-8, 10-23 and 25-43 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kahrcah

Date: April 24, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\\fk4\Documents\2019\2019-155\86956.doc